

### REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the thorough examination of the application that is reflected in the first Office Action dated December 27, 2006. Applicant also appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 8-23 are allowed, and that claim 6 and 28 are objected to but allowable if rewritten in independent form.

To expedite prosecution of this application, Applicant amends claims 1, 2, 9, 16 and 24, and cancels claim 28 without prejudice or disclaimer. In particular, Applicant amends claim 1 to include some of the recitations previously provided in its original dependent claim 2, amends claims 2, 9 and 16 to correct typographical errors, and amends claim 24 to incorporate recitations previously provided in its original dependent claim 28.

After entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-27 and 29 (28 total claims; 5 independent claims) remain pending in the application. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

#### Objections to the Abstract

The Office objects to the Abstract under MPEP §608.01(b) since it includes a title.

As indicated above, the title has been removed from the Abstract.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that this objection is moot.

#### Objections to the Specification

The Office objects to the page 14, line 3 of the disclosure since it includes a typographical error. As indicated above, page 14, line 3 of the Specification has been amended to fix this typographical error. Accordingly, Applicant submits that this objection is moot.

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §112, First ¶

The Office rejects claim 2 under 35 USC §112, first ¶ since it is misdescriptive. Applicant agrees and submit that claim 2 contains a typographical error which was overlooked when the application was filed. As indicated above, claim 2 has been amended to recite that "said processing module reads said multi-bit buffer at said clock signal to convert data bits of said input parallel bit stream into said input digital symbol." Applicant submits that this change fixes the typographical error in claim 2. Applicant makes similar amendments to fix the same typographical error which occurs in claims 9 and 16. Accordingly, Applicant submits that this rejection is moot.

Rejections Under 35 USC §103(a)

The Office rejects claims 1, 3, 7, 24-27 and 29 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubo et al. (USPN 6,907,085) in view of Isaksen et al. (USPN 6,973,141).

Claims 1-7

The Examiner indicated that claim 2 is objected to but allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 USC §112, first ¶ and to include all of the limitations of base claim 1. To expedite prosecution of this application, Applicant amends independent claim 1 to include some of the recitations previously provided in its original dependent claim 2. Applicants submit that amended claim 1 is patentable over the cited references since the cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1 for reasons analogous to claim 8, for example. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1, and its dependent claims 2-7, are now in condition for allowance.

Claims 24-27 and 29

The Examiner indicated that claim 28 is objected to but allowable if rewritten in independent form. To expedite prosecution of this application, Applicant amends independent claim 24. In particular, Applicant amends independent claim 24 to incorporate recitations previously provided in its original dependent claim 28. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 24, and its dependent claims 25-27 and 29, are now in condition for allowance.

In conclusion, for the reasons given above, all claims now presently in the application are believed allowable and such allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions or wish to further discuss this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney at (480) 385-5060.

If for some reason Applicant has not requested a sufficient extension and/or has not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent abandonment on this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: February 28, 2007

By: /ERIN P. MADILL/  
Erin P. Madill  
Reg. No. 46,893  
(480) 385-5060